



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov  ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 160383 90171			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/554,552	07/17/2000	LAURENT GAVOILLE	160383.90171	2788	
75	90 08/23/2005		EXAMINER		
MICHAEL J MCGOVERN			WALLERSON, MARK E		
QUARLES & BRADY 411 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005		
			·		
	•				
				·	
0-90C (Rev. 10/03)					

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/554,5	52	GAVOILLE ET AL.				
		Examine	r	Art Unit				
		Mark E. V	Vallerson	2626				
Period for	- The MAILING DATE of this communi r Reply	cation appears on th	o cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	9SS			
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION SIGNATE OF THIS COMMUNION SIGNATE OF THIS COMMUNION SIGNATED AND A COMMUNION SIGNATURE OF THE MALE OF THE OF THE MALE OF THE OF	CATION.  of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evunication.  of days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tinutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from dication to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status								
1)🖂 🖠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>17 March 2005</i>						
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	b)⊠ This action is r						
	·							
Disposition	on of Claims							
5) \( \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 5) \( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 6) \( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 7) \( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 7 \end{array} \end{array}								
Application	on Papers							
•	The specification is objected to by the		C abjected to butbe	in				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)⊠ 2	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority of the priority of the priority of the priority of the certified copies of the copies of the certified copies of the certified copies of the the attached detailed Office action	documents have bee documents have bee of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Rul	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receive le 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(	s)							
	of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Inform	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Plation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or FNo(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	eate Patent Application (PTO-15	52)			

Application/Control Number: 09/554,552 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

#### Part III DETAILED ACTION

## Notice to Applicant(s)

- 1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on 3/17/2005.
- 2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1-14 are pending.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bates et al (Bates) (U.S. 6,088,707).

With respect to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9, Bates discloses a process of navigating on a computer network (18) with a data processing device (20) comprising a screen (22) and a printer (24), wherein the server page (502 or 510) comprises information (512) and selection zones

(512) for selecting other pages (figure 24) and wherein the processing device further comprises means (26 or 519) for designating a selection zone (512) of the server page (502 or 510), the process comprising locating the selection zones transmitting the selection zones to the screen (22) and displaying the selection zones as a block of data in a display smaller than the size of a server page (520, figure 24 and column 19, line 46 to column 20, line 12), without displaying other information (figure 24) that was displayed with the selection zones on a the server page (figure 24, and calling up another page (514) by designating one of the displayed zones (figure 24).

With regard to claim 2, Bates discloses the data input fields are also displayed with the zones (figure 24), in which data can be entered by selecting the field using a cursor means (519) and entering data using the input means (the address could be entered (figure 24).

With respect to claim 5, Bates discloses the selection zones (512) and a window scanning the page are displayed alternately (figure 24).

With regard to claim 8, Bates discloses being able to recall a previous page upon request (column 18, line 53 to column 19, line 8).

With respect to claim 10, Bates discloses converting a page to HTML format (column 18, line 63 to column 19, line 3).

With regard to claims 11, 12, 13, and 14, Bates discloses the selection zones are displayes in a reduced size screen smaller than the size of the server page (figure 24).

Application/Control Number: 09/554,552 Page 4

Art Unit: 2626

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Isaac et al (Isaac) (U.S. 6,647,531).

With respect to claim 3, Bates differs from claim 3 in that he does not clearly disclose that the selection zones are made to scroll when the total size exceeds that of the screen.

Isaac discloses a method for customizing network documents wherein the user is allowed to scroll down a page when the information exceeds that of the page (figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Bates wherein the selection zones are made to scroll when the total size exceeds that of the screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Bates by the teaching of Isaac in order to allow the user to navigate a greater amount of information.

### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2626

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark E. Wallerson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7470. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday - 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark E. Wallerson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2626

MARKWALLERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER